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Introduction

Through testing by the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport, a large number of members of the UW football team were found to have been using banned substances. The University requested testing of the entire roster when it learned that the Waterloo Regional Police Service had taken a team member into custody on suspicion of trafficking in banned substances. The team member was subsequently charged. The University has suspended the team from any competition for a period of one year and put the head coach and assistant coach on paid leave from football operations pending the outcome of this review.

Terms of reference

The purpose of the review was to provide the University with insight into the circumstances which may have contributed to the testing results, with the ultimate objective of ensuring the health of the football program in years to come.

To that end the review team was requested to:

1. Assess how the climate, culture and leadership of interuniversity athletics on campus may have contributed to this situation.
2. Review UW's Athletics procedures, practices and policies as they relate to banned substances and assess their suitability.
3. Determine how widespread was the knowledge that banned substances were being used and over what period of time.
4. Provide additional observations, comments, and/or assessments as appropriate.

The review team was asked to present its report to the University of Waterloo Provost and the University of Waterloo Associate Provost, Student Services.

The review team

The team consisted of:

Larry Gravill        Chief, Waterloo Regional Police Service (Retired)
Mary Thompson        Professor Emerita, University of Waterloo
The review process

The review team began work on June 15, 2010, and gave a preliminary presentation of findings on August 10, 2010. During the review period, the team consulted regularly with the Associate Provost, Student Services and the Secretary of the University. In carrying out the assignment the team:

- Developed a project plan for the review process
- Developed interview instruments along with rationales for questions and their relationship to the Terms of Reference
- Interviewed staff and selected players (Appendix A), and consulted subject matter experts (Appendix B)
- Solicited input from all players for whom email contact information was available
- Compiled, collated, summarized and analyzed the interview and consultation results
- Acquired and reviewed relevant University of Waterloo and league documents, procedures and protocols (Appendix C)
- Acquired and reviewed external documents by external subject matter experts (Appendix D)
- Reviewed the CCES online course, True Sport Clean 101

The players selected to be asked directly for interviews included those who had tested positive or disclosed before testing that they had been using banned substances. Also asked were captains and team leaders, and a cross-section by years of play of other players who were known to be in the area. Some players responded to an email invitation sent out to all players, and a few were interviewed by telephone. Altogether, 14 players were interviewed, and email messages were received from several others.

With each player, the team began by communicating the terms of reference, and giving assurances that the player would not be asked to provide names, and that his comments would not be attributed. The review team is of the opinion that this approach was helpful in encouraging the majority of those invited to consent to interviews.

Disclaimers

- The review was conducted within timeframes that did not allow for extensive external analysis and comparisons.
- Certain aspects of the ‘situation’ are under investigation by the police and/or before the Courts. Information known to the Crown Prosecutor or the police may, at sometime in the future, provide additional information that was not available to the review team.
- The work of the review team was a review, not an investigation; therefore interview responses were taken at face value and were not subjected to investigative practices of verification or validation.
A synthesis of the interview results

Terms of Reference #1

Assess how the climate, culture and leadership of the team and of interuniversity sport on campus may have contributed to this situation.

There are several aspects of university football climate and culture which may have contributed to the situation. For one, football is the only sport in Canada where players are recruited in substantial numbers from university teams to the professional level (CFL). We heard in player interviews and testimonials that a big factor in the decision of some to take performance enhancing drugs (PEDs) is their desire to be able to play “at the next level”, namely in the professional leagues. Until very recently (announcement June 29, 2010) there has been no program of testing in the CFL.

The football roster is large, with about 100 members at the start of a season, and there is keen competition to be able to play in the season games. During their university career players work extremely hard to build up their strength through power lifting and other forms of working out. We heard the opinion that some players take PEDs to try to improve their chances of being able to play.

Not only among the players but in society as a whole, there is a great deal of rumour and speculation about use of performance enhancing drugs at all levels of the sport. Several of those interviewed noted that it would be naïve or “head in the sand” to expect that on a university football team there would be no players who were using PEDs. We heard many voice the conjecture that some of the players on rival teams must be using PEDs. This kind of belief may raise in some players the expectation that in order to succeed, they may have to do the same thing.

A great deal of information about the use of steroids is available on the internet. PEDs can be purchased on the internet. They can also be obtained from local suppliers, and are relatively easy to come by (though expensive). It is illegal to sell these drugs or to possess them for the purpose of trafficking, but it is not illegal to buy them for personal use.

Anecdotes were related that indicate conversations do occur among players about use of banned substances, for example when a player demonstrates exercise activities that seem beyond what he would normally be capable of.

Some comments even from players not using PEDs supported the notion that the culture anticipates the use of banned substances to be a matter of personal choice. We also heard the opinion that every player at some point is faced with the conscious decision whether or not to use PEDs.

Although we saw no evidence that the leadership of the team contributed to the situation, it was clear that managing the team is a challenge. We heard, for example, that entering
football players are less mature and less experienced with being away from home than their counterparts in hockey. They are relatively more difficult to supervise. The University of Waterloo coaches spend a good deal of time helping individual players deal with personal issues.

The administration and organization of the football team tend to set it apart. The Head Coach reports directly to the Athletics Director, while the head coaches of the other varsity teams report to the Associate Director. The football team has its own physician, and its own therapist and trainers. This separation may lead to somewhat different sets of rules and conventions.

The structure of the team is hierarchical. The tone in the locker room and on the team is set by the captains, a group of senior players chosen for their leadership qualities. It is emphasized to the captains that they are responsible for seeing that their teammates conduct themselves so as to bring credit to the team and the university. They are oftentimes the voices of the coaches to the players. They use social media to communicate important events and meetings. The coaches meet weekly with the captains to discuss issues including player behaviour issues. This system encourages captains to take initiatives on matters of conduct and discipline.

We heard that to many players, the team is like a family. The family-like structure means that coaches and captains would tend to try to deal with behaviour problems in the first instance informally, and within the team. As noted in the next section, for some issues with serious ramifications, such as handling suspicions of the use of banned substances, there has been no clear formal prescription for procedures, including record keeping and reporting.

Summary Points:

1. Some players have the perception that to be successful at the professional level it will be necessary to use banned substances.
2. Some players may be tempted to use banned substances in order to be able to play.
3. Rumour and speculation are a part of the football culture.
4. There is a widespread assumption that players on other teams are using banned substances.
5. Speculative conversations between players do occur about use of banned substances.
6. Some comments even from players not using PEDs support the notion that the culture anticipates the use of banned substances to be a matter of personal choice.
7. The discipline process for dealing with player behaviour issues, while clear to most, has had no formal prescription for dealing with some issues with serious ramifications.
Terms of Reference #2

Review UW's Athletics procedures, practices and policies as they relate to banned substances and assess their suitability.

Appendix C contains a detailed account of the major documents reviewed.

In recent years players have been told in many ways, formal and informal, that the use of banned substances such as PEDs is prohibited, and will lead to serious consequences. They received this information at orientation in speeches, in the University of Waterloo Interuniversity Student Athlete Handbook, on an anti-doping bulletin board, and through being required to complete an online course for all Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS) athletes, administered by the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES). In addition, each was required to sign a form, pledging to abide by all CIS doping control regulations, acknowledging that they can be tested at any time for use of banned substances, and promising to disclose their contact information so that they can be found.

The CCES online course has several sections consisting of a video followed by a short multiple-choice quiz. The sections concern anti-doping rules, sample collection procedures, the list of prohibited substances, supplements and sports nutrition products, and the dangers of pot use. (Cannabinoids are prohibited in-competition.) The only section which contains substantial information on health or injury risks is the section on pot use. Other sections focus on True Sport principles, regulations and sanctions.

This course requirement is important so that no player can plead ignorance of the rules and the consequences of violating them. However as an educational tool it is widely viewed by the players as ineffective. The videos consist mainly of text with voice-over, sometimes delivered quite rapidly. Several of those interviewed said that the course is no substitute for a live presentation. One noted that “Many players learn visually”. It is easy to complete the on-line education requirement without paying close attention, since the quiz questions are very straightforward.

In general, we found that although some information about the risks of PED use is widespread, there is a lack of systematic education for players on the health issues. The review disclosed that there is greater emphasis on apprehension and sanction than there is on the health of the individual, both in the online course and in the other materials they received, as described in Appendix C. Several of those interviewed expressed the view that systematic education should begin earlier in the high schools, and that University of Waterloo athletes might be able to play a role in this. In addition, there is a lack of education on PED use and how to deal with it for coaches and trainers. Athletics Director Bob Copeland is in the process of introducing measures to fill these education gaps, working with Don Hooton, Sr. of the Taylor Hooton Foundation to develop materials. It was also suggested that health care professionals including doctors and counselors be trained in the treatment of PED users.

Players are tested regularly for their performance in lifting and strength tests. The test results
are available for monitoring by the Athletics Department and the sports governing bodies, although they may not have been monitored routinely. In the days leading up to the group testing by the CCES in March, the Associate Director examined the records in order to try to select a group of players for “intelligent [drug] testing”, but reported finding that there were no players who stood out as posting rapid gains since the previous year.

The possibility of being subject to random testing by the CCES is well known and understood. It was the consensus of those we interviewed that the timing had been predictable in the sense that off-season testing had not occurred in recent years, and was thought unlikely to occur because of the expense involved in tracking players down. We heard from several that the off-season is likely the time when there would be greater use of PEDs, since the risk of associated injury would be reduced, and workouts and strength building are at a higher level than in the regimen of maintenance programs during the playing season. It was also felt by many that the number of tests done per season was so small as to render the chance of being tested negligible for most players. CIS has responded to this issue by planning to triple the number of tests next year, and to make the timing less predictable.

A University of Waterloo policy gap exists in that there has been no clear prescription for coaches, other staff or players for procedures to follow in the case of suspicion or knowledge of use of banned substances. Thus it appears that the reaction has been to some extent sport-specific and specific to the team leadership, rather than prescribed by the institution. There is a need for clear direction and support to coaches. There is also a need for a clear chain of reporting and “reporting thresholds”, from the players and captains to the coaches, and upward.

Summary points:

8. Information about prohibition and consequences of the use of banned substances is abundant.
9. The CCES online course is viewed by the players as ineffective as an educational tool.
10. There is a need for more effective education of players, particularly on the adverse health affects.
11. There is a need for further education and training of coaches, trainers, and health care professionals.
12. Performance testing is logged, and available for monitoring.
13. Current drug-testing practices have not acted as a sufficient deterrent to athletes who might choose to use PEDs.
14. A policy providing clear direction and support to coaches is needed.
15. A policy should also address or refresh the chain of reporting and reporting thresholds.
Determine how widespread was the knowledge that banned substances were being used and over what period of time.

The findings from our interviews can be summarized as follows, with some details provided in the rest of this section. We were told that knowledge of use of banned substances was not part of normal locker room chatter or part of general team discussion. We heard repeatedly the opinion that those who have actually made the decision to use or try PEDs are unlikely to confide this to many people. We conclude that the use of banned substances within the team was known to only a few players; we cannot conclude for how long it was known. The coaches had suspicions, which they acted upon, but not knowledge, that some players were using banned substances.

In our interviews, we asked about the extent to which other players might have known about the situation which led to the arrests, and the use of banned substances within the team. This led to the expression of a variety of opinions from players and staff, some of which touched on “social networks”. We heard that the roster of about 100 players had divisions into offensive and defensive positions, senior and junior players, those recruited before and since appointment of current coaching staff, leaders and non-leaders, and according to one respondent, those who would abide by the rules and those willing to break them. The freshmen lived together in residence, while the upper year players lived mainly off campus, often in houses with teammates. Players often knew each other from high school, particularly those who had gone to school in Waterloo Region. In team situations, particularly in season, they would be focused on working very hard, and on trying to combine academics with practices, workouts and games. Off season, they would continue to work out weekly according to a schedule, in most cases with the rest of the team on campus, as per team policy. They would socialize in small groups. Some participated in outreach activities such as Team Up presentations to high school students and football camps for younger players.

All of those interviewed said that they were surprised or shocked to learn about the trafficking, and most were surprised that the number of anti-doping violations discovered was as large as 9. The majority of players indicated that they had no knowledge of the use of PEDs within the team. A few suggested that they might have had suspicions of one person or another, on the basis of size or appearance. Several were surprised at the identities of some of the players who had been caught, since they had noticed no visible signs. Some of those who had tested positive or who had self-disclosed knew about one or two other players using. It was noted by several of those interviewed that a player using PEDs was unlikely to disclose to others, because of the stigma attached to requiring this kind of aid, as well as the consequences of being found out. One respondent expressed the opinion that often, even a roommate would not know whether someone was using banned substances.

Most captains said they would deal with banned substance use, if there were strong grounds for suspicion or certain knowledge; they might confront the supposed user, and would surely take the information to the coaches. Suspicion without any kind of substantiation would not suffice. Most players not in a leadership position said they would do nothing.
Don Hooton, Jr. of the Taylor Hooton Foundation told us that from his experience, players may joke about certain players abusing, perhaps as a message or trying to draw them out, but would not confront another player without overwhelming evidence. He said that some players have in later years confided that once into the "little steroid-net group" there was conversation, but any such talk was very covert. He noted that occasionally it is possible to spot a steroid user when he walks into a room because he is simply enormous, but most of the time an abuser is using one of a variety of substances for a particular purpose that would not give a visual indicator. He continued with a number of other examples to reinforce the fact that PED users do not talk about their use. People using banned substances often work out as hard or harder than teammates - dispelling the myth that steroids are a short cut for lazy athletes. He concluded the conversation by saying that the conundrum is that substance abuse is definitely happening on sports teams – those who deny that they are only fooling themselves - but as to specific use or a user making it known, that would rarely happen. These folks are cheating and they do not want anyone else to know.

Players and staff were asked about whether the coaches were aware of use, or had any suspicions. The coaches had asked two players several times through the past season whether they were using steroids. One respondent speculated that the coaches’ suspicions had been aroused because the players were working unusually hard. Both players (untruthfully) denied each time that they were using steroids. Some other players and staff had been aware of these players being questioned.

The coaches told us that they did not think they had special expertise concerning possible signs of use of PEDs. One coach would look for emotional changes, or actions that were out of character. The Team Doctor and the Director of Health Services in separate interviews concurred that it would often be difficult to detect use by visual signs, particularly if the drugs were taken orally.

Early in September of 2009, one player made an allegation to two coaches that another player was using steroids. The other player was brought in and denied that he was using steroids. The coaches kept the Athletics Director informed about the allegation and the process in dealing with it. They were of the opinion that the allegation was essentially rumour or innuendo, and could not provide the basis of a request to CIS for target testing of the individual. (See Appendix C for the CIS policy in 2009-2010.) Since the second player had tested clean in his first year, and denied the allegation, the matter was dropped.

At about the same time or shortly afterward, at the team orientation day, the message concerning not using banned substances was stressed. The Head Coach spoke to the team very strongly in another meeting or meetings, urging that if anyone was engaged in inappropriate or illegal activities he should cease and desist.

Players were asked whether the coaches would have wanted to know about the use of banned substances within the team. All who responded agreed, based on what they had heard from the coaches, that they would have wanted to know.
Summary points:

16. The use of banned substances was known to only a handful of players, and the review team cannot conclude how long they knew.
17. Those deciding to use banned substances would not be likely to disclose it to others.
18. Maintaining secrecy is important to a user.
19. Players and coaches were shocked by the trafficking charges, and surprised at the extent of the use of PEDs and the identities of some of the players.
20. Captains and other players would not confront a player with an allegation of use of PEDs without strong grounds for suspicion or certain knowledge.
21. Coaches did have some suspicions, and acted upon them by confronting players; the players denied use.
22. All those interviewed agreed that the coaches would have wanted to know about the use of banned substances within the team.

Terms of Reference #4

Provide additional observations, comments, and/or assessments as appropriate.

In reviewing the chronology of events we learned that, while a story given to the media by some team members in June was incorrect in some details, there was substance to it. In fact, an allegation had been made in September of 2009 about the use of banned substances by a player; coaches had reported the situation and it was dealt with. UW staff were mistaken in advising that no such allegation had been made. We are assured that improvements will be implemented in reporting policies and the thresholds for passing information up to higher UW authorities.

The facts of that incident are covered in the previous section. The incident provided valuable lessons regarding the need for note-keeping, minutes and witnesses for meetings with players that involve conduct issues. It also has brought forward suggestions that it would be desirable to have some mechanism for relatively low cost local screening and drug testing when suspicions are aroused, to increase the likelihood that a person using banned substances will be caught. One of our recommendations, supported in principle by our expert consultants, will be to explore this possibility. Nearly all those persons interviewed, and particularly the players, felt that while more awareness and education regarding banned substances is important, increasing the levels of enforcement would provide the biggest deterrent to the use of PED’s. In our conversation with Dick Pound of the IOC, he stressed the importance of no-notice and off-season testing.

We asked those interviewed to provide us with their observations about the coaches’ behaviour and actions. We were told that the coaches often spoke to the players, reminding
them to bring honour to their families, and make good decisions. They were perceived by those we interviewed as being diligent in stressing that banned substances were not to be used, wanting to know of any violations, and being prepared to take appropriate action.

The coaches and staff are proud of the relatively high academic performance of University of Waterloo athletes. We heard that the coaches emphasized strongly the importance of maintaining academic standing and obtaining the best possible education, as the main purpose of attending university. The Head Coach has made efforts to establish connections with other University of Waterloo teams, and maintain good relationships with academic leaders.

Many players have indicated that their athletic endeavours, workouts, practices, and team play, have provided a discipline and structure that greatly assisted their focus on academics. Reactivating a level of play for the team will provide a benefit to students that have adeptly integrated their academic pursuits and their sports activities.

The aftermath of the incidents at Waterloo has produced far-reaching consequences of what were assumed to be individual decisions. At least one person who had used a banned substance had believed that all the sanctions would relate only to the individual. He had felt that if he were caught only he would suffer the consequences. The player indicated that if he had known that the team would be punished he would not have taken PED’s. There is some reason to believe that if sanctions for the use of banned substances could be applied in some form to the entire team as well as the individual player, they may serve as an additional deterrent.

Summary points:

23. Lessons have been learned with respect to process in dealing with allegations or suspicions of banned substances.

24. There is a need for more testing, and a mechanism for local screening and testing to increase the likelihood that a person using banned substances will be caught.

25. There was much evidence of the importance coaches placed on academic education, family and making good decisions, and no evidence of collusion by the coaches in the use of PEDs.

26. There is some reason to believe that if sanctions for the use of banned substances could be applied in some form to the entire team as well as the individual player, they may serve as an additional deterrent.
Conclusions, observations and recommendations

We repeat here the list of summary points:

1. Some players have the perception that to be successful at the professional level it will be necessary to use banned substances.
2. Some players may be tempted to use banned substances in order to be able to play.
3. Rumour and speculation are a part of the football culture.
4. There is a widespread assumption that players on other teams are using banned substances.
5. Speculative conversations between players do occur about use of banned substances.
6. Some comments even from players not using PEDs support the notion that the culture anticipates the use of banned substances to be a matter of personal choice.
7. The discipline process for dealing with player behaviour issues, while clear to most, has had no formal prescription for dealing with some issues with serious ramifications.
8. Information about prohibition and consequences of the use of banned substances is abundant.
9. The CCES online course is viewed by the players as ineffective as an educational tool.
10. There is a need for more effective education of players, particularly on the adverse health affects.
11. There is a need for further education and training of coaches, trainers and health care professionals.
12. Performance testing is logged, and available for monitoring.
13. Current drug-testing practices have not acted as a sufficient deterrent to athletes who might choose to use PEDs.
14. A policy providing clear direction and support to coaches is needed.
15. A policy should also address or refresh the chain of reporting and reporting thresholds.
16. The use of banned substances was known to only a handful of players, and the review team cannot conclude how long they knew.
17. Those deciding to use banned substances would not be likely to disclose it to others.
18. Maintaining secrecy is important to a user.
19. Players and coaches were shocked by the trafficking charges, and surprised at the extent of the use of PEDs and the identities of some of the players.
20. Captains and other players would not confront a player with an allegation of use of PEDs without strong grounds for suspicion or certain knowledge.
21. Coaches did have some suspicions, and acted upon them by confronting players; the players denied use.
22. All those interviewed agreed that the coaches would have wanted to know about the use of banned substances within the team.
23. Lessons have been learned with respect to process in dealing with allegations or suspicions of banned substances.

24. There is a need for more testing, and a mechanism for local screening and testing to increase the likelihood that a person using banned substances will be caught.

25. There was much evidence of the importance coaches placed on academic education, family and making good decisions, and no evidence of collusion by the coaches in the use of PEDs.

26. There is some reason to believe that if sanctions for the use of banned substances could be applied in some form to the entire team as well as the individual player, they may serve as an additional deterrent.

From these summary points, some recommendations can be extracted.

(I) The University should continue its efforts to address the need for more effective education of athletes, earlier, particularly on the adverse health effects of the use of PEDs, but also on the ethics of sport. Enhanced training should be developed and provided for coaches and trainers in the promotion of ethical sport, and the detection of the use of banned substances. Health care professionals should receive training in the treatment of users of PEDs.

(II) The University should explore with its partners the possibility of implementing low cost local screening and target testing for the use of banned substances, to supplement the processes of CIS. The goals would be deterrence and early detection of problems. Such a program would necessitate carefully designed follow-up procedures.

(III) The University should continue its efforts to develop a policy for the handling of suspicions or allegations of the use of banned substances, to ensure that the same prescribed procedures are followed in all cases, individual rights are protected, and the chain of reporting and reporting thresholds are well understood.

In essence, the University cannot rely solely on the existing regulatory agencies, coach and/or player observations for its institutional due diligence concerning performance enhancing drugs, banned substances and illegal drugs. Steps are required to supplement the
work of those agencies and assist the team personnel by designing, implementing and enforcing a University policy. The policy should be consistent with and in accordance with the values, policies and practices of the University of Waterloo.
Appendix A: University of Waterloo interview list

Bob Copeland, Director of Athletics

Christine Stapleton, Associate Director of Athletics (on parental leave)

Dr. Barbara Schumacher, Director of Health Services

Brian Bourque, Coach, University of Waterloo Warriors Men’s Hockey Team

University of Waterloo Warriors Football personnel:

• Dennis McPhee, Head Coach
• Marshall Bingeman, Assistant Coach
• Joe Paopao, Assistant Coach
• Rob McMurren, Assistant Coach
• Dr. Tony Chris, Team Doctor
• 4 other staff connected to the team: therapists, trainers, and equipment manager
• 14 players on the team
Appendix B: External subject matter experts consulted

Don Hooton Sr. – President, Taylor Hooton Foundation

The Taylor Hooton Foundation for Fighting Steroid Abuse is a non-profit corporation founded in 2004. Corporate headquarters are in McKinney, TX. The THF was formed in memory of Taylor E. Hooton, a 17-year-old high school athlete, who took his own life as a result of the use of anabolic steroids.

From the foundation website:

Along with his family, Don Hooton formed the Taylor Hooton Foundation. He currently serves as the organization’s president and sits on the Board of Directors along with a group of distinguished volunteers. Don has spoken directly to hundreds of thousands of kids, parents, coaches, doctors, elite athletes, and others around the country. He has testified as an expert witness before Congress on three occasions, met with governors and legislators from a number of states, and other leaders that are interested in tackling this issue. In addition, he has told Taylor’s Story on a significant number of national (and international) television and radio shows in addition to major newspapers and magazines.

http://taylorhooton.org/foundation-history

Don Hooton Jr. – Director of Business Development, Taylor Hooton Foundation and University Varsity athlete – baseball

Dick Pound – International Olympic Committee (IOC)

Dick Pound, OC, OQ, is a Canadian lawyer, partner of the law firm Stikeman Elliott, the former president of the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) based in Montreal, and former chancellor of McGill University.

The review team gratefully acknowledges executive assistance from Trevor McCagherty.
Appendix C: Inventory of documents reviewed

**Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS)** is the national governing body of university sport in Canada. Fifty-one universities, 10,000 student-athletes and 550 coaches vie for 21 national championships in 12 different sports, including football. For further information, see [http://www.cis-sic.ca/](http://www.cis-sic.ca/).

**The Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sports (CCES)** is an independent, national, non-profit organization. It is the body which carries out drug testing of athletes at the request of organizations such as CIS. Its mission to foster ethical sport is carried out through research, promotion, education, detection and deterrence, as well as through programs and partnerships with other organizations. For further information, see [www.cces.ca](http://www.cces.ca).

Here follows a list of the main documents and resources reviewed.

1. **CCES Online Education for CIS Student-athletes.** We accessed the version available on August 5, 2010. Every athlete must complete this annually before being allowed to play in the season. Each athlete receives a certificate upon completion. There is a longer introductory version of about 1.25 hours, and a shorter version for later sittings.

   The course has several sections, each consisting of a video followed by a short multiple-choice quiz. The videos consist mainly of text with voice-over. The sections concern anti-doping rules, sample collection procedures, the list of prohibited substances, supplements and sports nutrition products, and the dangers of pot use. (Cannabinoids are prohibited in-competition.) The only section which contains substantial information on health or injury risks is the section on pot use. Other sections focus on True Sport principles, regulations and sanctions.

2. **CIS Student-Athlete Acknowledgment form.** (2009-2010) Every CIS student-athlete is required to sign this form. The form quotes from CIS policy:

   CIS is unequivocally opposed to the use by student athletes of any banned or restricted substances or methods in contravention of the rules of the national and/or international sport federations, the International Olympic Committee or Fédération Internationale du Sport Universitaire. CIS is equally opposed to any encouragement of the use of such substances and methods by individuals in positions of leadership in amateur sport (i.e. coaches, medical practitioners, sport scientists, administrators, team managers, etc.) or by the student-athletes themselves. Any student-athlete who has been proven through appropriate and due process to be in contravention of the rules of CIS and/or the respective National and/or International Sport Federation will be suspended from all CIS competition, including Conference and non-Conference play as per CIS policy. In consideration of being permitted to participate in Canadian University Sport, student-athletes allow CIS to: disclose their telephone number(s) and address to the CCES for its use in the conduct of the CIS Doping Control Program …
The statement to be signed reads:

By signing this form, I acknowledge that I have read, understand and will abide by Canadian Interuniversity Sport Eligibility and Doping Control Regulations. I also acknowledge having read CIS’ Personal Information Protection Policy and understand the contents thereof.


The handbook contains a section on health matters, including services available through the Athletics Department clinic and through Health Services. A subsection on Nutritional Supplements recommends that athletes do not take specific vitamins, nutritional supplements or herbal remedies because (i) some supplements may cause the athletes to test positively for PEDs (ii) the claims of the products may not be true, and (iii) many products such as Creatine have not been tested fully for consequences of long term use. It recommends that athletes consume a balanced diet, and offers assistance including access to the dietician at Health Services.

On P. 17 of the handbook a paragraph on the Integration of Athletics and Academics reads:

The University of Waterloo is committed to a holistic approach to student-athlete development. Students are at a crucial stage of their intellectual physical and social development. Athletic skill development should be encouraged alongside:

- Intellectual accomplishment, professional preparation and critical reflection;
- Health and well-being, including self-knowledge about health and well-being;
- Interpersonal and intercultural awareness and communication;
- A commitment to personal excellence, fair play and ethical behavior and a commitment to a lifetime of involvement in physical activity.

Under Interuniversity Policies, Section 4.3 Drugs and Drug Education reads:

Use of illegal and banned performance enhancing substances is not permitted and contrary to the ideals of amateur sport. For students competing in CIS sanctioned competition, completion of an on-line doping education program is mandatory to ensure eligibility and there are serious penalties if an athlete is found to be using banned or illegal substances. All CIS athletes are eligible to drug tested. Once the athlete signs their eligibility form, this is giving permission to be drug tested.

Section 4.7 on Student Discipline and Notification reads:

It is mandatory and the responsibility of all coaches and staff to immediately bring to the attention of the Associate Director and/or the Director any serious
incidents related to student-athlete behaviors that contravene the Student-Athlete Behavioral Expectations or Alcohol Policy. **Any disciplinary actions involving suspension from league or playoff competition MUST be brought to the attention of the Associate Director and/or Director before any such disciplinary action can be imposed on the player.**

The Associate Director conducts a mandatory attendance team orientation which outlines behavioural expectations and drug education prior to competition each year. In the case of Warrior Football in the Fall of 2009, this session was delivered by Associate Director Christine Stapleton, who handed out the athlete handbook in person to the team, and provided specific focus on the substance abuse section.

4. **Excerpts from University of Waterloo football playbook (2009-2010).** In the football playbook, under Club Policies, it is noted that:

   You are also reminded that as players, you have to abide by the same [rules] as the rest of society, excessive use of alcohol and any use of any narcotic or illegal drug **will not be condoned.**

Under Notes to Remember appears:

   The consumption of alcohol is not permitted during the week and is confined to post game evenings only, and only for those who are of age. Alcohol is not permitted in the locker room, team buses or on road trips. Use of illegal substances at any time is strictly prohibited. .... The team will be attending the show Single and Sexy as well as a special seminar on Alcohol and Drug Abuse which is mandatory for all.

There could be greater clarity in the playbook around illegal vs banned, legal drugs with adverse effects.


The policy discusses both unannounced random testing and target testing (brought out by suspicions of particular individuals).

Of particular interest for this review were the sections on target testing. The following are excerpts from this policy:

   Any CIS athlete may be selected at random or may be chosen for target testing. An athlete may be selected more than once in any calendar year. **Target testing may be conducted at any time and can take place in competition or out of competition (i.e. training, practice, etc.).**

   Target testing is one of the selection methods used by CIS and the CCES to enhance its doping control program. This method allows the CCES to focus testing on an athlete or group of athletes based on information received from
a legitimate, identifiable source. This type of unannounced testing allows the CCES and CIS to act on information quickly to ensure that potentially problematic situations are appropriately dealt with. In order to carefully and confidentially review potential concerns of this nature, CIS, in accordance with CCES procedures, has established the following protocol for target testing.

Individuals who have information that would strongly suggest that banned substances or methods are being used are asked to provide a letter, in confidence, to the CIS office, to the attention of the Director, Operations & Development. This letter should contain the following information:

a) name of the athlete(s);
b) sport;
c) reason or rationale for concern;
d) source of information;
e) name and phone number of individual writing the letter; and
f) other information as per specific circumstances.

CIS shall forward the letter to the CCES including all necessary information required to conduct sample collection.

The decision to proceed, or not, with the test and the subsequent coordination of sample collection will be carried out by the CCES independently of CIS.

The wording of the policy implied that the CIS procedure for requesting target testing required definite grounds for suspicion which could be stated. Such a requirement can deter action when grounds are indefinite or when information is given in strict confidence.

In practice target testing could be implemented rapidly, as evidenced by the events of March 2010.


The sections on target testing have been changed to make any information about possible doping activity reportable to CIS:

Target testing is one of the selection methods used by CIS and the CCES to enhance its doping control program and ensure that any doping concerns have been brought forward and acted upon in a timely manner. This method allows the CCES to focus testing on an athlete or group of athletes based on information received from a legitimate, identifiable source. This type of
testing allows the CCES and CIS to act on information quickly to ensure that potentially problematic situations are appropriately dealt with.

In order to carefully and confidentially review potential concerns of this nature, CIS athletes and members should contact the CCES with any information that would suggest an athlete or member is engaged in a doping activity. This information would be examined by the CCES to determine if a target test or investigation should occur. The CCES may share this information with the CIS office to obtain any further details that may be required to conduct a target test assessment or complete the sample collection.

The decision to proceed, or not, with the test and the subsequent coordination of sample collection will be carried out by the CCES independently of CIS.

7. Press release from the CCES, CIS and the CFL, August 10, 2010. Excerpts from this press release deal with new anti-doping measures to be put in place for football players.

CCES will immediately launch an independent task force on the use of performance enhancing substances in football. The task force will look at the prevailing attitudes and trends, if any, towards the use of performance enhancement drugs and the extent to which they may be used in the sport of football. Depending on their findings, the task force may work across sectors to identify and develop recommendations on federal, provincial and municipal actions that may be taken to address the issue of performance enhancing drug use in football; and, provide recommendations for stakeholder actions that may be implemented to tackle the problem. On the basis of their findings during their examination of football, the task force may also comment on the situation that may exist more broadly within all of sport.

More details including the task force membership will be provided in the coming weeks.

CIS will host an Anti-Doping Symposium on Friday, November 26, in conjunction with the 2010 Vanier Cup at Université Laval in Quebec City. The Symposium will feature practical hands-on sessions designed for coaches and trainers. There will also be sessions tailored for athletic directors and senior administration to discuss policy, testing, and doping education approaches. The agenda will also include a presentation by the CCES Task Force on the use of Performance Enhancing Substances in Football on its findings and recommendations.

CCES will increase the number of tests allocated to the CIS football testing program by reallocating tests and focusing on the more at-risk periods during the off-season.

The CFL has agreed to:
- Identify, from the ranks of CIS teams, 80 top prospects each year for the CFL’s Evaluation Camp and Canadian Draft.
- Provide funding for more extensive testing of those top prospects.
- Participate in a public education program that emphasizes to minor football and CIS players that the best way to get to the pros is through dedication and hard work, not the use of performance enhancing drugs that pose a serious threat to an athlete’s health and the integrity of the game.

On the same day CIS announced to member universities:

In the upcoming 2010-11 season we will be combining an increased volume of testing with the intelligent allocation of the tests that are being done to target at risk areas. CIS has worked with CCES to introduce new and unpredictable protocols around drug testing.

One important element involves increasing the number of tests as a method of catching cheaters and deterring drug usage. A concerted effort is being developed. Commencing in the fall of 2010, we expect that the volume of university football tests will at least triple that of 2009-10. There were 89 tests done in 2009-10 (excluding University of Waterloo extraordinary testing) which represents a little over 5% of university football players (27 teams x 60 players). In 2010-11 this percentage will increase to the 15% range through the addition of tests sponsored by the CFL and targeted towards top prospects, and additional and redistributed tests from the CCES. CIS football playing universities have also communicated their support to financially support additional football testing in 2010-11. The precise number of additional tests funded by CIS members will be confirmed in November with a view to having the tests conducted during the next “at risk” period for steroid use in football.

**Intelligent testing:** There is a need to keep precise testing planning information confidential in order to make it unpredictable and maintain its deterrent impact, however in broad terms there will be more out-of-competition done during “at risk” times of the season, and directed in a strategic fashion.

CIS has begun collecting whereabouts information and physical performance statistics from all football programs in CIS. The whereabouts information will enable CCES to conduct unannounced testing at any time during the year. The physical performance data will enable some tests to be directed towards athletes who demonstrate unusual weight gains or performance improvements in short periods of time.

CIS is a signatory to the Canadian Anti-Doping Program which means we are governed by and abide by the processes and penalties of WADA. CIS and CCES will engage in discussions to reduce the administrative burden
associated with the doping control program. While still respecting the banned list, the penalties and the public disclosure elements of the doping program, we believe there are administrative efficiencies that may be realized, which may free up resources for additional testing and educational initiatives.

8. **Information about the Taylor Hooton Foundation.**


The foundation’s family of programs called Hoot’s Chalk Talk has been created to raise the awareness and provide education on the subject of the use and abuse of appearance and performance enhancing drugs (APEDs) by the youth of America with a focus on anabolic steroids and supplements. Two programs make up core educational programs of the Taylor Hooton Foundation (THF): a) An in-person multi-media program called **Hoot's Chalk Talk**, and b) An online program called **Hoot's Chalk Talk e-Learning Program**. The courses for coaches are in beta testing phase.

9. **Presentation on Youth and Steroids Pilot Project**, by the Windsor Essex County Health Unit.


The goals of the project were to evaluate the effectiveness of posters, wallet cards for youth, a coaches booklet and parent pamphlet in raising awareness of young athletes between the ages of 14 and 17 years old, coaches, and parents about the issues of anabolic steroids and supplement use in sports. The presentation has some interesting examples of resources, but does not contain the study findings.
Appendix D. Some medical literature

The review team would like to thank Ms Gayle Jessop, Region of Waterloo Health Services Librarian, and Dr. Barbara Schumacher, Director of Health Services, University of Waterloo, for providing useful references to the medical literature.


From the abstract: Ergogenic drugs are substances that are used to enhance athletic performance. These drugs include illicit substances as well as compounds that are marketed as nutritional supplements. Many such drugs have been used widely by professional and elite athletes for several decades. However, in recent years, research indicates that younger athletes are increasingly experimenting with these drugs to improve both appearance and athletic abilities. … Anabolic steroids and creatine do offer potential gains in body mass and strength but risk adverse events to multiple organ systems. Steroid precursors, growth hormone, and ephedra alkaloids have not been proven to enhance any athletic measures, whereas they do impart many risks to their users … This article summarizes the current literature regarding these ergogenic substances and details their use, effects, risks and legal standing.


From the abstract: … A review of the literature revealed that most laboratory studies did not investigate the actual doses of AAS currently abused in the field. … The available scientific literature describes that short-term administration of these drugs by athletes can increase strength and body weight. … Although AAS administration may affect erythropoiesis and blood haemoglobin concentrations, no effect on endurance performance was observed. … The main untoward effects of short- and long-term AAS abuse that male athletes most often self-report are an increase in sexual drive, the occurrence of acne vulgaris, increased body hair and increment of aggressive behaviour. AAS administration will disturb the regular endogenous production of testosterone and gonadotrophins that may persist for months after drug withdrawal. Cardiovascular risk factors may undergo deleterious alterations, including elevation of blood pressure and depression of serum high-density lipoprotein (HDL)-, HDL2- and HDL3-cholesterol levels. In echocardiographic studies in male athletes, AAS did not seem to affect cardiac structure and function, although in animal studies these drugs have been observed to exert hazardous effects on heart structure and function. In studies of athletes, AAS were not found to damage the liver. Psyche and behaviour seem to be strongly affected by AAS. Generally, AAS seem to induce increments of aggression and hostility. Mood disturbances (e.g. depression, [hypo-]mania, psychotic features) are likely to be dose and drug dependent. …

From the abstract: The dietary supplement industry is completely unregulated in the United States; as a consequence, an abundance of supplement products contain substances that are prohibited in sport – typically stimulants or anabolic steroid precursors. Many supplements contain substances (e.g. ephedrine) that have been associated with significant morbidity and mortality. Sport practitioners have particular responsibilities in addressing this issue. Athletes need to be aware of the problems that can follow supplement use, and sport authorities need to ensure that nutritional education and guidelines for athletes is of the highest standard. The need for the appropriate regulation of dietary supplements is emphasized.

*UpToDate®* is a licensed database, to be accessed by subscription.

This article reviews the literature on the topic of the use of PEDs by athletes, and is updated periodically. It includes sections on the prevalence of use of PEDs; the pharmacology of androgens, androgen precursors, growth hormone and other PEDs; information on the detection of use; and summaries of studies on the efficacy and side effects of use. It points out that knowledge of the possible effects of these medications is incomplete because “the doses and even the medications used have rarely been studied in a controlled fashion”.

Prevalence estimates vary widely. According to the article, “It is difficult to know how commonly athletes take these medications since they are so often taken surreptitiously. In fact, athletes use elaborate schemes to avoid detection.”

Adverse effects of androgen use cited include suppression of endogenous testicular function, psychological disorders, some risk factors for cardiovascular disease, and infections from drug injection.